

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12 are amended. Support for the amended claims can be found, for example, on page 8, lines 13-15, page 9, line 2 – page 10, line 10 in the specification. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the March 11, 2004 personal interview with Examiner Ehichioya and Primary Examiner Alam. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed the Office Action mailed January 29, 2004 and the November 3, 2003 filed Request for Reconsideration in response thereto.

In particular, Applicants argued that Shimotsuji and Kumagai, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest extracting conditions input means for inputting a condition of extracting a specific data input form out of the plural data input forms, as recited in claim 1.

However, the Examiner asserted that Shimotsuji's extraction means for extracting line data (col. 2, lines 1-41), and Kumagai's extracting condition of input data for the kind of condition input data to be extracted (col. 3, lines 33-61), would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kumagai with the teachings of Shimotsuji.

Applicants then argue that Shimotsuji merely discloses a plurality of form data registered in the file memory which are displayed in order and the user selects one form in which he wants to observe the document. This relates to displaying form data, not to a condition of extracting a specific data input form out of plurality of data input forms.

Accordingly, no conditions are specified in Shimotsuji for inputting a condition of extracting a specific data input form out of the plural data input forms.

Further, Applicants also argued that Shimotsuji merely discloses image input means for inputting image data of a new document. That is, Shimotsuji discloses a means to input image data for a new document, which has nothing to do with inputting the extracting conditions. Thus, Shimotsuji does not disclose or suggest "extracting conditions input means for inputting a condition of extracting a specific data input form out of the plural data input form", as recited in claim 1.

However, the Examiner was not responsive to these arguments and stated that he will maintain his rejection to Shimotsuji in view of Kumagai.

Applicants then presented Examiner Ehichioya with a proposed amendment to claim 1. The Examiner indicated during the interview that the proposed amendment appears to be distinguishable over the applied references. However, the Examiner stated that any amendments after a Final Rejection will require further search and/or consideration, and thus an Advisory Action will be issued. Thus, Applicants have filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with this Amendment to expedite prosecution of this application.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,815,704 to Shimotsuji et al. (hereinafter "Shimotsuji") in view of U.S. Patent 5,438,682 to Kumagai. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed and agreed during the interview, Shimotsuji and Kumagai, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a text file containing the character strings extracted from the data input form is made up when the character strings have been extracted from each of the plural data input forms, as recited in claims 1, 5 and 9, and similarly recited in claims 4, 8 and 12.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimotsuji and Kumagai, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11, which depend from the independent claims are likewise distinguished over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David J. Cho
Registration No. 48,078

JAO:DXC/brc

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: April 27, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--